energies

MDPI

Article

The Impact of Consumer Schwartz Values and Regulatory Focus on the Willingness to Pay a Price Premium for Domestic Food Products: Gender Differences

Paweł Bryła

Department of International Marketing and Retailing, Faculty of International and Political Studies, University of Lodz, Narutowicza 59a, 90-131 Lodz, Poland; pawel.bryla@uni.lodz.pl; Tel.: +48-426655830

Abstract: This paper aims to identify which Schwartz values and regulatory focus orientations influence consumer behavior on the food market in the domain of preference for domestic products, which is closely related to consumer ethnocentrism. The CAWI (Computer-Assisted Web Interviews) method was applied. The sample consisting of 1000 respondents was representative for the Polish adult population in terms of sex, age, education, place of living (rural vs. urban), and region. The willingness to pay (WTP) a higher price for domestic products was affected by the tradition and universalism values. Consumer value orientations and regulatory focus were more powerful in explaining the WTP than demographic or socio-economic variables. The theories of value orientations and regulatory focus were found to be more relevant for men than for women, as reflected in adjusted regression determination coefficients. Finally, the promotion regulatory focus was a significant predictor of the WTP among men, but not among women. Based on my findings, it is recommended (1) to emphasize the following elements in marketing communications in order to stimulate the purchases of domestic food products: appeals to tradition, customs, ecology, being natural; (2) to take into account the Schwartz values in consumer segmentation on the food market; (3) to differentiate marketing communications for domestic food products on the basis of gender segmentation: in messages addressed to male consumers, arguments appealing to the promotion orientation should be used more frequently.

Keywords: willingness to pay (WTP) a higher price for domestic products; consumer ethnocentrism; schwartz theory of values; higgins regulatory focus theory; food marketing; consumer behavior; gender differences; local food preference

Citation: Bryła, P. The Impact of Consumer Schwartz Values and Regulatory Focus on the Willingness to Pay a Price Premium for Domestic Food Products: Gender Differences. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 6198. https://doi.org/10.3390/en14196198

Academic Editor: Karolina Pawlak

Received: 23 August 2021
Accepted: 24 September 2021
Published: 28 September 2021

1. Introduction

Consumers often prefer domestic products to imported counterparts, e.g., American consumers prefer domestic-originated beef to imported beef [1]. The bias of consumers towards domestic goods offers a vital clue to marketing strategies [2]. The impact of ethnocentrism on consumer willingness to buy domestic products is dependent on the country of origin, product category [3], and relative quality perceptions [4]. There is a strong relation between country-of-origin effect and consumer ethnocentrism [5]. The home country bias in product evaluation is driven by both economic and socio-psychological motives [6]. Conservation types of values are positively related to consumer ethnocentrism [3]. Personal values, moral foundations and gender-role identities exert direct and indirect effects on the formation of consumers' ethnocentric orientation [7]. There is a need to identify the personal values of the consumer to interpret the effect of consumer ethnocentrism accurately [8].

In this paper, I focus on the comparison between domestic food (i.e., originating from Poland) and foreign counterparts. I apply the Schwartz theory of values and the regulatory focus theory to investigate predictors of the willingness to pay a higher price (WTP). Previous research, presented in the Literature Review section below, shows the relevance of

these two theoretical frameworks in investigating consumer behavior on the food market. This study is the first to show which Schwartz values and regulatory focus orientations influence consumer willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food products, which may be considered an aspect of consumer ethnocentrism and home-country bias. This topic is important also because, in my opinion, the consumption of domestic food products affects all 3 dimensions of sustainable development: economic (capturing more value added by domestic supply chains), social (supporting local farmers), and environmental (reducing food miles). Since previous research has shown important gender differences in consumers' WTP behaviors [9–13], I focus on comparisons between men and women.

My principal research questions are as follows:

RQ1. Do any Schwartz values affect the willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food products? If so, which ones?

RQ2. Does any regulatory focus affect the willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food products? If so, which one?

RQ3. Is there any difference in Schwartz values or regulatory focus affecting the willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food products between men and women?

The major contribution of this research is to improve our knowledge about the mechanism underlying consumer willingness to pay a higher price for home-country products by identifying psychographic characteristics of consumers increasing this WTP on the food market. Two major theoretical frameworks established in consumer research: Schwartz values theory and Higgins regulatory focus theory are applied. Moreover, I explore differences between men and women in this regard. This study is based on an online survey in a representative sample of Polish consumers.

The paper is structured as follows. The Literature Review section provides some information about previous applications of willingness-to-pay indicators, the Schwartz theory and Higgins theory on the food market. The Materials and Methods section describes sample representativeness criteria and the principal measurement scales used in this research. The Results section presents bivariate and multivariate analyses of the impact of values and regulatory focus orientations on the willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food. Regression models without and with control variables are developed for the total sample, and separately for men and women. Finally, the Discussion and Conclusions section discusses the theoretical and managerial implications of my findings as well as the study limitations.

2. Literature Review

The willingness to pay a higher price has been used in analyses of consumer behavior on the food market, e.g., comparing regional products to conventional products [14], comparing organic food to conventional food [15–20], comparing organic to all-natural food [21], examining different organic logos [22], multi-ingredient, processed organic food products [23], green purchasing behavior [24], bio-based products [25], non-genetically modified food [26], functional food [27], food embodying a living wage and safe working conditions for farmworkers [28], local production [29], traditional food [30], food with quality labels [31], government certification program, followed by third-party certification, a traceability system, and a product-specific information label [32], food labelled "raised without antibiotics" [33], HACCP-certified food [34], food quality and safety [35,36], vegetable snacks [37], healthier processed food [38], eco-labeled apples [39], bottled water [40], milk offered in biodegradable packaging [41], milk from gene-edited cows [42], a change in steak quality [43], capture and culture fish [44], bitten food in pictures [45].

The Schwartz theory of values [46] has been extensively used in consumer behavior studies, including the investigation of food consumption. Food-related lifestyles depend on the Schwartz values [47]. Convenience food consumption and convenience orientation in the food domain are mainly connected with values that motivate people to seek new experiences, act independently and enhance their own personal interests, while are in conflict with values of conservation and self-transcendence [48]. Organic food consumption

is related to such values as security, hedonism, universalism, benevolence, stimulation, self-direction, and conformity [49]. The values theory was used to identify consumer segments in the organic food market [50]. Understanding and use of sustainability labels are affected by human values as measured by the Schwartz value domains [51]. Consumer values (achievement, conservation, and universalism) play an important role in how goal priming works to promote healthier food choices [52]. A large cross-cultural study revealed that men attribute consistently more importance than women do to power, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, and self-direction values; the reverse is true for benevolence and universalism values and less consistently for security values [53].

The regulatory focus theory [54] has also brought about important contributions in consumer behavior research [55]. Consumers are interested in different product features depending on their focus; whereas in the prevention focus they are more interested in safety-oriented aspects, in the promotion focus they concentrate more on comfort-oriented qualities. Focus compatible products are evaluated more positively [56]. Promotion focus is positively related to global consumption orientation and prevention focus is negatively related to it [57]. Consumers with promotion focus have higher intention to eat ethnic food than consumers with prevention focus [58]. There are gender differences in the mechanism underlying the relationship between regulatory foci and subjective well-being [59].

3. Materials and Methods

My research purpose was to investigate the predictors of consumer willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food on the basis of two theoretical frameworks: Schwartz values theory and Higgins regulatory focus theory. A nationwide, representative survey among 1000 respondents was conducted with the use of the CAWI (Computer-Assisted Web Interview) method.

The benefits of using this method include relatively low costs, fast data collection, convenience for respondents, as they can return to the questionnaire and complete it at their preferred time and place, and reduced time for data analysis, as the answers are coded automatically in a spreadsheet. There is comparable quality of measurement using CAWI and PAPI (paper and pencil interviews) ways of collecting data, as the scales are reliable enough and the answers for open questions are content rich. Moreover, technical possibilities in CAWI, especially the position rotation of scales and forcing responses, may contribute to obtaining better quality data [60].

The representativeness criteria included: sex, the age structure in 10-year intervals, education level (primary, basic vocational, secondary, and tertiary), the place of living (rural areas vs. urban areas), and region. Additionally, the similarity of the structure by age was required separately for males and females in 10-year intervals. It was allowed to draw the sample from an Internet panel on the basis of quotas specified in the assumptions, but weighting results was forbidden.

The questionnaire was prepared by the author of this paper on the basis of scales validated in previous research studies [46,54,61–72]. A pilot survey was conducted to improve the instrument. The questionnaire consisted of 41 questions, including 37 single-choice questions (17 of which were composed of lists of items) and 4 open-ended questions (asking to provide a number).

The survey was conducted in February 2020 by a specialized market research agency. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study (to analyze opinions and attitudes of consumers of food products in Poland) and were assured that their answers will be used only for scientific purposes in the respect of the principle of anonymity.

The regression models include standardized coefficients (denoted as β) with standard errors (SE(β)), unstandardized coefficients (denoted as b) with standard errors (SE(b)), t-statistics, and *p*-values. The statistical analyses were conducted in TIBCO Statistica Version 13.3 (TIBCO Software Inc., Palo Alto, CA, USA).

The sample representativeness criteria were fulfilled in a satisfactory manner. As far as sex is concerned, the structure of respondents matched exactly the structure of the popu-

lation of Poland aged 15 and more (52.2% of females and 47.8% of males). Regarding the age structure, it was sufficiently close to that of the general population with the exception of the oldest group, which was underrepresented. The average age of respondents was 46.4 years, and the age ranged from 15 to 84. The sample resembled the general population almost perfectly in terms of the region of living. Not only all the 16 Polish regions (*województwa*—voivodships) were present in the sample, but also their relative shares matched very closely the actual structure of the Polish population, with the deviations not exceeding 0.3 percentage points. The sample also resembled very well the general population in terms of the urban-rural divide (a deviation of only 0.1 percentage point). Finally, the sample was sufficiently representative for the population of Poland regarding the level of education.

The dependent variable was measured with the use of the following question: 'Are you willing to pay more for Polish food products compared to their foreign counterparts?' with 5 answer options: 'Definitely yes', 'Rather yes', 'I don't know', 'Rather not', and 'Definitely not'. In the data analysis stage, they were attributed scores 5-1, respectively. This operationalization of the willingness to pay stemmed from my interest in the intention to pay for a broad category of products and the fact that the WTP tends to be overstated in hypothetical valuation questions as compared to when actual payment is required [73]. This way of examining WTP as a qualitative decision of whether to pay more was also used in previous research [74].

The value orientations of respondents were measured with the use of the framework proposed by Shalom Schwartz [46] from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 10 values were taken into consideration: self-direction, power, security, hedonism, benevolence, achievement, stimulation, conformity, universalism, tradition (Table 1). The corresponding items in Polish for these 10 values were taken from the CBOS 2012 survey, question 24. The answers were measured on a 6-point scale with textual labels: 'Very similar', 'Similar', 'Somewhat similar', 'Slightly similar', 'Not similar', 'Completely not similar', which were subsequently coded 6-1, respectively.

Table 1. The measurement scale for the Schwartz values.

Value	Now I Will Briefly Describe Various Persons. Please Specify on the Basis of Each Description to What an Extent the Given Person Is Similar to You. For This Person, It Is Important:
Self-direction	(1) to think up new ideas, to be creative, to do thinks in one's own way
Power	(2) to be rich, to have a lot of money and expensive things
Security	(3) to live in secure surroundings, to avoid anything that might be dangerous
Hedonism	(4) to have a good time, to „spoil" oneself
Benevolence	(5) to help the people around, to care for their well-being
Achievement	(6) to be successful, to have one's achievements recognized
Stimulation	(7) to take risks and look for adventures, to have an exciting life
Conformity	(8) to behave properly, to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong
Universalism	(9) to look after the environment, to care for nature
Tradition	(10) to respect tradition, to follow the customs handed down by one's religion or family

Note: 6-point scales with textual labels were used for each item. Source: [46,66].

The 11-item Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ) was applied (Table 2) in order to establish the promotion and prevention orientations of our respondents. The Polish translation of Bąk et al. [62] was used, with the change from direct second-person questions into the more official way addressing the respondents (by Sir/Madam in Polish) to make it consistent with the rest of my questionnaire. The scales for the answer options are exactly as in the original [54]—5-point scales with 2 or 3 anchors. The promotion and prevention focus indices were calculated with the use of the RFQ scoring key provided in [75], and the regulatory focus predominance index was calculated according to [76]. This index was also called an RFQ index [77].

Table 2. The Regulatory Focus Questionnaire.

Question
Q1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life?
Q2. Growing up, would you ever "cross the line" by doing things that your parents would not tolerate?
Q3. How often have you accomplished things that got you "psyched" to work even harder?
Q4. Did you get on your parents' nerves often when you were growing up?
Q5. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?
Q6. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable?
Q7. Do you often do well at different things that you try?
Q8. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.
Q9. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don't perform as well as I ideally would like to do.
Q10. I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.
Q11. I have found very few hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them.

Note: 5-point scales with 2 or 3 anchors were used for each item. Source: [54,62].

4. Results

Approximately 2/3 of the respondents declared their willingness to pay a premium for food products from their own country (answers 'definitely yes' and 'rather yes' combined). For almost 1/5 of the study participants, this attribute of food products was definitely a sufficient reason to pay a higher price compared to imported counterparts, and for almost half of the study subjects, it was rather sufficient. Women were likely to declare their higher WTP than men, as shown in Table 3, but the Mann Whitney U-test indicated that this difference was not statistically significant ($Z = -1.583$, $p = 0.114$).

Table 3. The willingness to pay for the Polish origin of food products (%).

Answer	Total	Men	Women
Definitely yes	18.4	17.2	19.5
Rather yes	47.1	46.4	47.7
I don't know	22.2	21.5	22.8
Rather not	9.4	11.3	7.7
Definitely not	2.9	3.6	2.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Regarding the Schwartz values, the highest scores in the total sample were observed for universalism, benevolence, and self-direction, and the lowest ones for power, stimulation, achievement, and hedonism. Gender differences were observed for 4 values with the use of the Mann-Whitney U-test. Men were characterized by higher levels of power and stimulation, and women were more strongly driven by benevolence and universalism (Table 4). As far as the regulatory focus is concerned, the total sample had a balanced level of promotion and prevention orientations, resulting in the predominance index close to zero. Men had significantly lower prevention and higher predominance levels than women.

In the total sample, the willingness to pay a higher price for food of the domestic origin correlated with all Schwartz values except power and hedonism (Table 5). The strongest correlations were observed with tradition and universalism ($r > 0.2$). The WTP also correlated with the promotion orientation of the study participants. Both among men and women, significant correlations of the WTP were observed for the same Schwartz values, and in both cases, the strongest were with tradition and universalism. However, men displayed stronger correlations than women. Moreover, the promotion regulatory focus and the predominance index correlated significantly with the WTP among men, but not among women.

Table 4. The Schwartz values and regulatory focus by sex.

Consumer Characteristics	Total	Sex		Comparison M-W (Mann-Whitney U-Test)	
		Men	Women	Z	*p*
Schwartz values					
Self-direction	4.523	4.483	4.559	−1.464	0.143
Power	3.295	3.379	3.218	1.980	**0.048**
Security	4.302	4.257	4.343	−1.270	0.204
Hedonism	3.927	3.992	3.868	1.424	0.154
Benevolence	4.645	4.552	4.730	−2.853	**0.004**
Achievement	3.931	3.977	3.889	1.111	0.267
Stimulation	3.831	3.964	3.709	3.058	**0.002**
Conformity	4.180	4.186	4.174	0.261	0.794
Universalism	4.674	4.577	4.762	−2.684	**0.007**
Tradition	4.237	4.209	4.262	−0.739	0.460
Regulatory focus					
Promotion	3.262	3.253	3.269	−0.726	0.468
Prevention	3.167	3.105	3.229	−2.799	**0.005**
Predominance index	0.092	0.149	0.040	2.164	**0.030**

Table 5. Pearson correlation coefficients of the willingness to pay a price premium for the Polish origin of food products with the Schwartz values and regulatory focus by sex.

Consumer Characteristics	Total Population		Men		Women	
	r	*p*	r	*p*	r	*p*
Schwartz values						
Self-direction	0.131	**0.000**	0.150	**0.001**	0.110	0.012
Power	0.050	0.111	0.029	0.526	0.080	0.068
Security	0.072	**0.023**	0.079	0.086	0.061	0.161
Hedonism	0.054	0.091	0.049	0.285	0.065	0.140
Benevolence	0.174	**0.000**	0.174	**0.000**	0.165	**0.000**
Achievement	0.121	**0.000**	0.094	**0.040**	0.152	**0.001**
Stimulation	0.096	**0.002**	0.120	**0.009**	0.089	**0.043**
Conformity	0.105	**0.001**	0.113	**0.014**	0.100	**0.023**
Universalism	0.227	**0.000**	0.254	**0.000**	0.191	**0.000**
Tradition	0.252	**0.000**	0.313	**0.000**	0.193	**0.000**
Regulatory focus						
Promotion	0.084	**0.008**	0.165	**0.000**	0.004	0.934
Prevention	0.015	0.639	0.022	0.630	−0.002	0.969
Predominance index	0.045	0.157	0.105	**0.022**	0.004	0.933

In order to check the simultaneous impact of all Schwartz values and regulatory focus orientations on consumer willingness to pay a price premium for domestic food, a series of multiple regression models were constructed. First, I examined the impact of these independent variables without any covariates (Table 6). The analysis shows that the WTP was significantly and positively related to 3 Schwartz values: tradition, universalism, and achievement. The strongest predictor was the tradition value (β = 0.209, ***p*** = **0.000**), followed by universalism (β = 0.132, ***p*** = **0.000**), and achievement (β = 0.082, ***p*** = **0.030**). It is worth noting that the regulatory focus did not influence the dependent variable. This regression model explained over 9% of the variance of the WTP (adjusted R^2 = 0.093) and was highly significant (F(12.987) = 9.528, ***p*** = **0.000000**).

Table 6. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products in the whole sample without control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(987)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	1.994	0.278	7.166	**0.000**
Self-direction	0.053	0.035	0.047	0.031	1.530	0.126
Power	0.000	0.037	0.000	0.028	0.011	0.991
Security	−0.012	0.034	−0.010	0.029	−0.356	0.722
Hedonism	−0.020	0.037	−0.016	0.030	−0.525	0.599
Benevolence	0.040	0.037	0.037	0.034	1.088	0.277
Achievement	0.082	0.038	0.065	0.030	2.178	**0.030**
Stimulation	0.006	0.038	0.004	0.030	0.149	0.881
Conformity	−0.032	0.035	−0.027	0.029	−0.926	0.355
Universalism	0.132	0.037	0.122	0.034	3.608	**0.000**
Tradition	0.209	0.034	0.148	0.024	6.227	**0.000**
Promotion	0.029	0.033	0.053	0.058	0.901	0.368
Prevention	−0.024	0.032	−0.036	0.048	−0.760	0.448

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

Second, I added selected demographic and socio-economic covariates to the model to check the impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus in more realistic settings, as respondents vary in terms of sex, age, education, income, place of living, and household size (Table 7). It turned out that these control variables led to the reduction of significant predictors among the Schwartz values. Now it is only tradition (β = 0.195, ***p*** = **0.000**) and universalism (β = 0.136, ***p*** = **0.000**). Moreover, one of the control variables was significant in this model, namely the household size (β = 0.099, ***p*** = **0.001**). It is worth noting that the Schwartz values were a more powerful predictor of the WTP than the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of respondents. Adding these 6 control variables led to an increase in the variance explained of only 1%, as the adjusted determination coefficient of this full model was R^2 = 0.103, compared to R^2 = 0.093 in the previous regression. This model was also highly significant (F(18.981) = 7.371, ***p*** = **0.000000**).

Table 7. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products in the whole sample with control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(981)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	1.829	0.311	5.874	**0.000**
Self-direction	0.050	0.034	0.045	0.031	1.453	0.147
Power	−0.005	0.037	−0.004	0.028	−0.141	0.888
Security	−0.012	0.034	−0.010	0.028	−0.367	0.714
Hedonism	−0.017	0.037	−0.014	0.030	−0.467	0.641
Benevolence	0.035	0.037	0.033	0.034	0.960	0.337
Achievement	0.073	0.038	0.058	0.030	1.933	0.054
Stimulation	0.004	0.038	0.003	0.030	0.092	0.927
Conformity	−0.021	0.035	−0.018	0.029	−0.615	0.539
Universalism	0.136	0.037	0.125	0.034	3.695	**0.000**
Tradition	0.195	0.034	0.138	0.024	5.796	**0.000**
Promotion	0.031	0.033	0.056	0.058	0.958	0.338
Prevention	−0.021	0.032	−0.032	0.048	−0.666	0.506
Sex (men vs. women)	−0.045	0.031	−0.088	0.060	−1.475	0.141
Age (in years)	−0.034	0.033	−0.002	0.002	−1.029	0.304
Education (higher vs. other)	−0.018	0.033	−0.040	0.072	−0.552	0.581
Income (income group)	0.016	0.031	0.013	0.026	0.505	0.614
Place of living (rural vs. urban)	0.034	0.033	0.067	0.065	1.036	0.301
Household size (members)	0.099	0.031	0.080	0.025	3.185	**0.001**

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

In order to check if there are any problems with multicollinearity, I have constructed a correlation matrix with all independent variables used in my regression models (Table 8).

The strongest correlations were observed between hedonism and stimulation (0.470), power and achievement (0.466), achievement and stimulation (0.441), benevolence and universalism (0.430), hedonism and achievement (0.421), power and hedonism (0.419). As all the correlations are weak or moderate, the risk of multicollinearity is low.

Additionally, I opted for examining the impact of the Schwartz values and the regulatory focus on the willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food separately among men and among women, because my bivariate analyses showed some important differences across genders. I ran the same regressions, but separately for males and for females. I also did it in 2 configurations: without control variables and with the demographic and socio-economic variables added. In the simpler model among men (Table 9), only tradition ($\beta = 0.265$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.000}$) and universalism ($\beta = 0.126$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.017}$) affected the WTP significantly, whereas an analogous model among women (Table 10) showed a significant impact of 3 Schwartz values: tradition ($\beta = 0.150$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.002}$), achievement ($\beta = 0.124$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.026}$), and universalism ($\beta = 0.122$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.019}$). There is a difference in the set of significant predictors across genders. It is also worth noting that Schwartz values and regulatory focus are much more relevant in explaining the WTP among men than among women, which is reflected in the adjusted determination coefficient being more than twice as high in the regression for men ($R^2 = 0.124$) than for women ($R^2 = 0.057$). Both models were significant ($F(12.465) = 6.648$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.000000}$, for men, and $F(12.509) = 3.644$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.00003}$, for women).

In the regression model with control variables among men (Table 11), the WTP is significantly affected by the tradition ($\beta = 0.241$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.000}$) and universalism ($\beta = 0.137$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.010}$) Schwartz values, but also by the promotion regulatory focus ($\beta = 0.095$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.047}$) as well as one of the control variables—household size ($\beta = 0.101$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.024}$). This model explains the largest share of the variance of the dependent variable (adjusted $R^2 = 0.134$) and is significant ($F(17.460) = 5.332$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.000000}$). An analogous model for women demonstrated a significant impact of the same predictors except the regulatory focus (Table 12). Here, the WTP was associated with tradition ($\beta = 0.145$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.003}$), universalism ($\beta = 0.134$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.011}$), and household size ($\beta = 0.096$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.031}$). This model explained only 6.0% of the WTP variance (adjusted $R^2 = 0.060$), and was also significant ($F(17.504) = 2.972$, $\boldsymbol{p} = \mathbf{0.00006}$).

Table 8. Correlation matrix for independent variables used in my regression models.

Variable No.	Variables	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.
1.	Sex	0.48	0.50																	
2.	Age	46.40	17.30	**−0.063**																
3.	Education	0.27	0.44	−0.048	**−0.249**															
4.	Place of living	0.39	0.49	0.027	**0.251**	**−0.281**														
5.	Household size	3.46	1.21	−0.049	**−0.096**	**−0.101**	**0.124**													
6.	Income	3.08	1.19	0.022	0.019	**0.180**	**−0.148**	−0.023												
7.	Self-direction	4.52	1.09	−0.035	0.004	−0.008	0.007	0.038	0.059											
8.	Power	3.30	1.29	0.062	**−0.086**	0.031	−0.011	**0.089**	**0.134**	**0.223**										
9.	Security	4.30	1.15	−0.037	−0.029	−0.008	0.020	−0.019	0.012	**0.176**	**0.147**									
10.	Hedonism	3.93	1.21	0.051	**−0.069**	0.020	−0.009	0.056	**0.094**	**0.242**	**0.419**	**0.199**								
11.	Benevolence	4.65	1.04	**−0.086**	0.006	**−0.064**	0.002	0.020	−0.028	**0.337**	−0.023	**0.279**	**0.181**							
12.	Achievement	3.93	1.24	0.036	**−0.127**	0.028	0.002	**0.086**	0.056	**0.241**	**0.466**	**0.154**	**0.421**	**0.196**						
13.	Stimulation	3.83	1.26	**0.101**	**−0.069**	−0.022	−0.012	**0.099**	**0.114**	**0.247**	**0.395**	0.008	**0.470**	**0.185**	**0.441**					
14.	Conformity	4.18	1.16	0.005	0.031	0.003	0.050	−0.046	0.014	**0.070**	**0.092**	**0.273**	0.059	**0.212**	**0.214**	0.012				
15.	Universalism	4.67	1.05	**−0.088**	**0.119**	−0.009	0.013	−0.008	0.038	**0.252**	0.021	**0.256**	**0.076**	**0.430**	**0.112**	**0.165**	**0.335**			
16.	Tradition	4.24	1.37	−0.019	0.051	−0.023	0.061	**0.090**	0.012	0.049	0.027	**0.157**	0.025	**0.246**	**0.064**	0.056	**0.344**	**0.321**		
17.	Promotion	3.26	0.54	−0.014	−0.003	**0.084**	−0.003	−0.003	**0.084**	**0.275**	0.006	0.007	0.026	**0.178**	**0.095**	**0.143**	−0.036	**0.197**	0.003	
18.	Prevention	3.17	0.65	**−0.095**	0.052	**0.063**	0.033	**−0.063**	−0.030	−0.038	**−0.112**	**0.138**	**−0.159**	0.026	−0.056	**−0.210**	**0.129**	**0.112**	**0.147**	**0.115**

Notes: M—mean, SD—standard deviation; correlations significant at $p < 0.05$ are boldfaced.

Table 9. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products among men without control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(465)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	1.432	0.416	3.445	**0.001**
Self-direction	0.062	0.048	0.059	0.047	1.278	0.202
Power	−0.032	0.051	−0.025	0.040	−0.628	0.531
Security	0.008	0.048	0.007	0.042	0.160	0.873
Hedonism	−0.004	0.052	−0.003	0.043	−0.073	0.942
Benevolence	0.021	0.050	0.020	0.049	0.416	0.677
Achievement	0.040	0.053	0.034	0.045	0.753	0.452
Stimulation	0.047	0.052	0.041	0.045	0.913	0.362
Conformity	−0.042	0.050	−0.038	0.045	−0.834	0.405
Universalism	0.126	0.052	0.117	0.049	2.403	**0.017**
Tradition	0.265	0.047	0.197	0.035	5.626	**0.000**
Promotion	0.092	0.047	0.172	0.088	1.958	0.051
Prevention	−0.030	0.045	−0.052	0.078	−0.669	0.504

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

Table 10. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products among women without control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(509)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	2.583	0.378	6.831	**0.000**
Self-direction	0.044	0.050	0.036	0.042	0.871	0.384
Power	0.028	0.055	0.021	0.040	0.518	0.604
Security	−0.022	0.048	−0.018	0.039	−0.455	0.649
Hedonism	−0.029	0.054	−0.022	0.041	−0.541	0.589
Benevolence	0.055	0.054	0.049	0.049	1.010	0.313
Achievement	0.124	0.056	0.091	0.041	2.226	**0.026**
Stimulation	−0.023	0.057	−0.017	0.040	−0.413	0.680
Conformity	−0.024	0.050	−0.018	0.039	−0.478	0.633
Universalism	0.122	0.052	0.112	0.048	2.345	**0.019**
Tradition	0.150	0.048	0.101	0.033	3.092	**0.002**
Promotion	−0.036	0.046	−0.061	0.078	−0.777	0.437
Prevention	−0.027	0.046	−0.036	0.061	−0.595	0.552

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

Table 11. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products among men with control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(460)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	1.089	0.460	2.369	**0.018**
Self-direction	0.064	0.048	0.061	0.046	1.320	0.188
Power	−0.036	0.051	−0.028	0.040	−0.697	0.486
Security	0.001	0.048	0.001	0.043	0.023	0.982
Hedonism	−0.008	0.052	−0.006	0.043	−0.148	0.882
Benevolence	0.018	0.051	0.018	0.050	0.360	0.719
Achievement	0.038	0.053	0.032	0.045	0.725	0.469
Stimulation	0.039	0.052	0.033	0.045	0.744	0.457
Conformity	−0.035	0.051	−0.032	0.046	−0.693	0.488
Universalism	0.137	0.053	0.128	0.049	2.594	**0.010**
Tradition	0.241	0.048	0.179	0.035	5.051	**0.000**
Promotion	0.095	0.047	0.178	0.089	1.995	**0.047**
Prevention	−0.022	0.045	−0.038	0.078	−0.488	0.626
Age (in years)	−0.009	0.046	−0.001	0.003	−0.189	0.850
Education (higher vs. other)	−0.060	0.047	−0.141	0.109	−1.294	0.196
Income (income group)	0.039	0.044	0.034	0.039	0.892	0.373
Place of living (rural vs. urban)	0.044	0.046	0.089	0.095	0.944	0.346
Household size (members)	0.101	0.045	0.084	0.037	2.270	**0.024**

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

Table 12. The impact of the Schwartz values and regulatory focus on the WTP a price premium for domestic food products among women with control variables.

Predictor	β	SE(β)	b	SE(b)	t(504)	*p*
Intercept	x	x	2.410	0.419	5.750	**0.000**
Self-direction	0.042	0.050	0.035	0.042	0.834	0.405
Power	0.031	0.055	0.022	0.040	0.556	0.579
Security	−0.023	0.048	−0.019	0.039	−0.481	0.631
Hedonism	−0.022	0.054	−0.017	0.042	−0.407	0.684
Benevolence	0.046	0.055	0.041	0.050	0.829	0.407
Achievement	0.109	0.056	0.080	0.041	1.941	0.053
Stimulation	−0.030	0.057	−0.021	0.040	−0.532	0.595
Conformity	−0.022	0.050	−0.017	0.039	−0.435	0.664
Universalism	0.134	0.052	0.123	0.048	2.548	**0.011**
Tradition	0.145	0.049	0.098	0.033	2.981	**0.003**
Promotion	−0.031	0.046	−0.053	0.079	−0.672	0.502
Prevention	−0.023	0.046	−0.031	0.061	−0.503	0.615
Age (in years)	−0.038	0.049	−0.002	0.003	−0.784	0.434
Education (higher vs. other)	0.022	0.048	0.045	0.098	0.458	0.647
Income (income group)	−0.013	0.045	−0.010	0.035	−0.278	0.781
Place of living (rural vs. urban)	0.019	0.047	0.037	0.090	0.413	0.680
Household size (members)	0.096	0.045	0.075	0.035	2.159	**0.031**

Note: β denotes standardized regression coefficients, b denotes unstandardized regression coefficients.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The main contribution of this paper lies in identifying Schwartz values and regulatory focus orientations affecting consumer willingness to pay a higher price for domestic food products. This phenomenon was investigated in 3 settings: in the total sample, among men, and among women. Even though the willingness to pay a premium price for domestic food is positively correlated with almost all Schwartz values and the promotion orientation, multivariate analyses allowed to identify a few significant predictors. The regression model without control variables enabled to indicate 3 values which determine the WTP, namely tradition, universalism, and achievement. When some control variables were added to the model, only 2 values remained as significant predictors: tradition and universalism, and no regulatory focus was significant. This finding answers my research questions RQ1 and RQ2. Therefore, thanks to this research, we know that consumers respecting tradition, following customs, and caring for the environment, are more likely to pay a higher price for food from their home country. This finding has important theoretical and managerial implications. It contributes to the development of the theory of consumer ethnocentrism by incorporating constructs from the value orientation theory and the regulatory focus theory. It also provides valuable hints for marketers what to emphasize in marketing communications in order to stimulate the purchases of domestic food products: appeals to tradition, customs, ecology, being natural. This is consistent with previous research on origin food, which found that the traditional recipe was the top selection motive and natural taste was the top determinant of perceived authenticity [78]. Moreover, the finding about universalism is consistent with previous research on organic menus, as altruistic value was found to significantly affect biosphere values, which in turn influenced WTP via pro-environmental attitude [79].

Second, the psychographic criteria turned out to be much more important in shaping the WTP than demographic and socio-economic characteristics of consumers (as shown by standardized regression coefficients and *p*-values). Therefore, it is recommended to take into account the Schwartz values in consumer segmentation on the food market. This finding is consistent with previous studies on the WTP in other contexts: for innovative food attributes [80], for fair trade products [81], for organic food [82], for ecosystem services in Mediterranean high nature value farmland [83], and for biofuels [84].

Third, my findings demonstrated an important difference between genders regarding the role of value orientations and regulatory focus in shaping the WTP for domestic food,

which relates to my research question RQ3. These characteristics are much more relevant for men than for women, according to the adjusted determination coefficients of the regression models (both without and with control variables), which implies that women may be affected to a larger extent by other variables, not captured by the Schwartz value theoretical framework or by the regulatory focus theory. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that congruence between message regulatory focus and the message recipient's gender is more effective for men than for women [85].

Fourth, the promotion regulatory focus was a significant predictor of the WTP among men, but not among women, which provides further information in response to my research question RQ3. This means that, whenever possible, it is worth differentiating marketing communications for domestic food products on the basis of the gender segmentation. In messages addressed to male consumers, arguments appealing to the promotion orientation rather than the prevention orientation should be used more frequently.

This study is not without limitations. First, the sample representativeness criteria were limited to age, education, urban-rural divide, and region. Adding more representativeness criteria and conducting cross-cultural surveys would further enhance the external validity of my results, but I considered this set of criteria as sufficient taking into consideration the cost-benefit approach to the research design. Second, all the variables were self-reported rather than observed. This stemmed from the choice of the survey methodology, which enabled to obtain a sufficient level of sample representativeness and to collect a wide variety of data. Future studies may be based on a mixed methodology, e.g., combining retailer shopping data with a survey, or using an experimental setting. Third, there are alternative ways to estimate the willingness to pay a higher price. I opted for this simple Likert-style question, which enabled to examine consumer attitude to this issue, but did not allow to calculate the size of this willingness either in absolute monetary terms or as a percentage of price. I opted for this method of estimating the WTP, because I examined a broad category of products (all kinds of domestic food), and I was interested in the relative WTP for domestic food compared to imported counterparts rather than the exact level of the WTP.

Funding: This research was funded by the National Science Centre, Opus grant number 2017/25/B/HS4/00031. The APC was funded by the National Science Centre, Opus grant number 2017/25/B/HS4/00031.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, because according to the Work regulations of the Committee for Research Bioethics of the University of Lodz (attachment to Ordinance No. 149 of the Rector of the University of Lodz of 15.07.2013), the consent of this committee was not required for the kind of studies conducted in this research project. The consent is necessary for biological, medical, chemical, and physical research projects using biological material collected from humans, as well as research interfering with the human psyche. My survey did not fall into these categories.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the author.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

References

1. Lim, K.H.; Hu, W.; Maynard, L.J.; Goddard, E.U.S. Consumers' Preference and Willingness to Pay for Country-of-Origin-Labeled Beef Steak and Food Safety Enhancements. *Can. J. Agric. Econ. Can. D'agroeconomie* **2012**, *61*, 93–118. [CrossRef]
2. Upadhyay, Y.; Singh, S.K. Preference for Domestic Goods: A Study of Consumer Ethnocentrism. *Vis. J. Bus. Perspect.* **2006**, *10*, 59–68. [CrossRef]
3. Balabanis, G.; Mueller, R.; Melewar, T.C. The Relationship Between Consumer Ethnocentrism and Human Values. *J. Glob. Mark.* **2002**, *15*, 7–37. [CrossRef]

4. Wang, C.L.; Chen, Z.X. Consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy domestic products in a developing country setting: Testing moderating effects. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2004**, *21*, 391–400. [CrossRef]
5. Bryła, P. The Importance of Country-of-Origin Information on Food Product Packaging. *Nutrients* **2021**, *13*, 3251. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
6. Verlegh, P.W.J. Home country bias in product evaluation: The complementary roles of economic and socio-psychological motives. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* **2007**, *38*, 361–373. [CrossRef]
7. Prince, M.; Yaprak, A.; Cleveland, M.; Davies, M.A.; Josiassen, A.; Nechtelberger, A.; Nechtelberger, M.; Palihawadana, D.; Renner, W.; Supekova, S.C.; et al. The psychology of consumer ethnocentrism and cosmopolitanism: A five-country study of values, moral foundations, gender identities and consumer orientations. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **2020**, *37*, 1013–1049. [CrossRef]
8. Ma, J.; Yang, J.; Yoo, B. The moderating role of personal cultural values on consumer ethnocentrism in developing countries: The case of Brazil and Russia. *J. Bus. Res.* **2020**, *108*, 375–389. [CrossRef]
9. Alphonce, R.; Alfnes, F.; Sharma, A. Consumer vs. citizen willingness to pay for restaurant food safety. *Food Policy* **2014**, *49*, 160–166. [CrossRef]
10. Gracia, A.; de Magistris, T.; Nayga, R.M. Importance of Social Influence in Consumers' Willingness to Pay for Local Food: Are There Gender Differences? *Agribusiness* **2012**, *28*, 361–371. [CrossRef]
11. Illichmann, R.; Awudu, A. Analysis of consumer preferences and willingness-to-pay for organic food products in Germany. In Proceedings of the 2013 Annual Meeting of the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association (AAEA), Washington, DC, USA, 4–6 August 2013.
12. Radam, A.; Yacob, M.R.; Bee, T.S.; Selamat, J. Consumers' perceptions, attitudes and willingness to pay towards food products with "no added Msg" labeling. *Int. J. Mark. Stud.* **2010**, *2*, 65–77. [CrossRef]
13. Ureña, F.; Bernabéu, R.; Olmeda, M. Women, men and organic food: Differences in their attitudes and willingness to pay. A Spanish case study. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2007**, *32*, 18–26. [CrossRef]
14. Bryła, P. Regional Ethnocentrism on the Food Market as a Pattern of Sustainable Consumption. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 6408. [CrossRef]
15. Bryła, P. Organic food consumption in Poland: Motives and barriers. *Appetite* **2016**, *105*, 737–746. [CrossRef]
16. Bryła, P. Uwarunkowania skłonności do płacenia wyższej ceny za żywność ekologiczną w porównaniu z produktami konwencjonalnymi. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu* **2018**, *526*, 203–213. (In Polish) [CrossRef]
17. Gil, J.M.; Gracia, A.; Sanchez, M. Market segmentation and willingness to pay for organic products in Spain. *Int. Food Agribus. Manag. Rev.* **2000**, *3*, 207–226. [CrossRef]
18. Krystallis, A.; Chryssohoidis, G. Consumers' willingness to pay for organic food: Factors that affect it and variation per organic product type. *Br. Food J.* **2005**, *107*, 320–343. [CrossRef]
19. Sehra, K.K.; MacMillan, D.C. Wildlife-friendly food requires a multi-stakeholder approach to deliver landscape-scale biodiversity conservation in the Satoyama landscape of Japan. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2021**, *297*, 113275. [CrossRef]
20. Yiridoe, E.K.; Bonti-Ankomah, S.; Martin, R.C. Comparison of consumer perceptions and preference toward organic versus conventionally produced foods: A review and update of the literature. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* **2005**, *20*, 193–205. [CrossRef]
21. Yormirzoev, M.; Li, T.; Teuber, R. Consumers' willingness to pay for organic versus all-natural milk—Does certification make a difference? *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2021**, *45*, 1020–1029. [CrossRef]
22. Janssen, M.; Hamm, U. Product labelling in the market for organic food: Consumer preferences and willingness-to-pay for different organic certification logos. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2012**, *25*, 9–22. [CrossRef]
23. Batte, M.T.; Hooker, N.; Haab, T.C.; Beaverson, J. Putting their money where their mouths are: Consumer willingness to pay for multi-ingredient, processed organic food products. *Food Policy* **2007**, *32*, 145–159. [CrossRef]
24. Moser, A.K. Thinking green, buying green? Drivers of pro-environmental purchasing behavior. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2015**, *32*, 167–175. [CrossRef]
25. Morone, P.; Caferra, R.; D'Adamo, I.; Falcone, P.M.; Imbert, E.; Morone, A. Consumer willingness to pay for bio-based products: Do certifications matter? *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* **2021**, *240*, 108248. [CrossRef]
26. Costa-Font, M.; Gil, J.M.; Traill, W.B. Consumer acceptance, valuation of and attitudes towards genetically modified food: Review and implications for food policy. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 99–111. [CrossRef]
27. Boncinelli, F.; Piracci, G.; Casini, L. Understanding the role of information and taste heterogeneity in consumer preferences for functional beef: The case of the omega-3 enriched burger. *Meat Sci.* **2021**, *181*, 108614. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
28. Howard, P.; Allen, P. Consumer willingness to pay for domestic 'fair trade': Evidence from the United States. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* **2008**, *23*, 235–242. [CrossRef]
29. Darby, K.; Batte, M.T.; Ernst, S.; Roe, B. Decomposing Local: A Conjoint Analysis of Locally Produced Foods. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **2008**, *90*, 476–486. [CrossRef]
30. Balogh, P.; Békési, D.; Gorton, M.; Popp, J.; Lengyel, P. Consumer willingness to pay for traditional food product. *Food Policy* **2016**, *61*, 176–184. [CrossRef]
31. Velčovská, Š.; Del Chiappa, G. The Food Quality Labels: Awareness and Willingness to Pay in the Context of the Czech Republic. *Acta Univ. Agric. Et Silvic. Mendel. Brun.* **2015**, *63*, 647–658. [CrossRef]
32. Ortega, D.L.; Wang, H.H.; Wu, L.; Olynk, N.J. Modeling heterogeneity in consumer preferences for select food safety attributes in China. *Food Policy* **2011**, *36*, 318–324. [CrossRef]

33. Shen, Y.; Hamm, J.A.; Gao, F.; Ryser, E.T.; Zhang, W. Assessing Consumer Buy and Pay Preferences for Labeled Food Products with Statistical and Machine Learning Methods. *J. Food Prot.* **2021**, *84*, 1560–1566. [CrossRef]
34. Gedikoğlu, H.; Gedikoğlu, A. Consumers' awareness of and willingness to pay for HACCP-certified lettuce in the United States: Regional differences. *Food Control* **2021**, *130*, 108263. [CrossRef]
35. Grunert, K.G. Food quality and safety: Consumer perception and demand. *Eur. Rev. Agric. Econ.* **2005**, *32*, 369–391. [CrossRef]
36. Riccioli, F.; Moruzzo, R.; Zhang, Z.; Zhao, J.; Tang, Y.; Tinacci, L.; Boncinelli, F.; De Martino, D.; Guidi, A. Willingness to pay in main cities of Zheijiang provice (China) for quality and safety in food market. *Food Control* **2020**, *108*, 106831. [CrossRef]
37. Tsai, M.; Cash, S.B.; Anzman-Frasca, S.; Goldberg, J.P.; Johnson, S.K.; Oslund, J.; Folta, S.C. Helping parents provide vegetable snacks: Investigating price and taste as barriers. *Appetite* **2021**, *166*, 105481. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
38. Dominguez-Viera, M.E.; Berg, M.V.D.; Donovan, J.; Perez-Luna, M.E.; Ospina-Rojas, D.; Handgraaf, M. Demand for healthier and higher-priced processed foods in low-income communities: Experimental evidence from Mexico City. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2022**, *95*, 104362. [CrossRef]
39. Loureiro, M.; McCluskey, J.J.; Mittelhammer, R.C. Will Consumers Pay a Premium for Eco-Labeled Apples? *J. Consum. Aff.* **2002**, *36*, 203–219. [CrossRef]
40. Bass, D.A.; McFadden, B.R.; Messer, K.D. A case for measuring negative willingness to pay for consumer goods. *Food Policy* **2021**, *104*, 102126. [CrossRef]
41. Cammarelle, A.; Viscecchia, R.; Bimbo, F. Intention to Purchase Milk Packaged in Biodegradable Packaging: Evidence from Italian Consumers. *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 2068. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
42. Kilders, V.; Caputo, V. Is Animal Welfare Promoting Hornless Cattle? Assessing Consumer's Valuation for Milk from Gene-Edited Cows under Different Information Regimes. *J. Agric. Econ.* **2021**, *72*, 735–759. [CrossRef]
43. Lusk, J.L.; Schroeder, T.C. Are Choice Experiments Incentive Compatible? A Test with Quality Differentiated Beef Steaks. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **2004**, *86*, 467–482. [CrossRef]
44. Mitra, S.; Khatun, M.N.; Prodhan, M.H.; Khan, A. Consumer preference, willingness to pay, and market price of capture and culture fish: Do their attributes matter? *Aquaculture* **2021**, *544*, 737139. [CrossRef]
45. Meersseman, E.; Geuens, M.; Vermeir, I. Take a Bite! The Effect of Bitten Food in Pictures on Product Attitudes, Purchase Intentions, and Willingness to Pay. *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 2096. [CrossRef]
46. Schwartz, S. A Proposal for Measuring Value Orientations across Nations. 2001. Available online: https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/methodology/ess_methodology/source_questionnaire/source_questionnaire_development.html (accessed on 7 April 2021).
47. Brunsø, K.; Scholderer, J.; Grunert, K.G. Testing relationships between values and food-related lifestyle: Results from two European countries. *Appetite* **2004**, *43*, 195–205. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
48. Botonaki, A.; Mattas, K. Revealing the values behind convenience food consumption. *Appetite* **2010**, *55*, 629–638. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
49. Aertsens, J.; Verbeke, W.; Mondelaers, K.; Van Huylenbroeck, G. Personal determinants of organic food consumption: A review. *Br. Food J.* **2009**, *111*, 1140–1167. [CrossRef]
50. de Maya, S.R.; López-López, I.; Munuera, J.L. Organic food consumption in Europe: International segmentation based on value system differences. *Ecol. Econ.* **2011**, *70*, 1767–1775. [CrossRef]
51. Grunert, K.G.; Hieke, S.; Wills, J. Sustainability labels on food products: Consumer motivation, understanding and use. *Food Policy* **2014**, *44*, 177–189. [CrossRef]
52. Sihvonen, J.; Luomala, H. Hear what I appreciate: Activation of consumption motives for healthier food choices across different value segments. *Int. Rev. Retail. Distrib. Consum. Res.* **2017**, *27*, 502–514. [CrossRef]
53. Schwartz, S.H.; Rubel, T. Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **2005**, *89*, 1010–1028. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
54. Higgins, E.T.; Friedman, R.S.; Harlow, R.E.; Idson, L.C.; Ayduk, O.N.; Taylor, A. Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* **2001**, *31*, 3–23. [CrossRef]
55. Higgins, E.T.; Nakkawita, E.; Cornwell, J.F.M. Beyond outcomes: How regulatory focus motivates consumer goal pursuit processes. *Consum. Psychol. Rev.* **2020**, *3*, 76–90. [CrossRef]
56. Werth, L.; Foerster, J. How regulatory focus influences consumer behavior. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* **2007**, *37*, 33–51. [CrossRef]
57. Westjohn, S.A.; Arnold, M.J.; Magnusson, P.; Reynolds, K. The Influence of Regulatory Focus on Global Consumption Orientation and Preference for Global versus Local Consumer Culture Positioning. *J. Int. Mark.* **2016**, *24*, 22–39. [CrossRef]
58. Cui, H.-J.; Fam, K.-S.; Zhao, T.-Y. Regulatory focus and message framing's effects on intention to consume ethnic food in China. *Br. Food J.* **2019**, *122*, 1969–1982. [CrossRef]
59. Li, R.; Liu, H.; Yao, M.; Chen, Y. Regulatory Focus and Subjective Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Coping Styles and the Moderating Role of Gender. *J. Psychol.* **2019**, *153*, 714–731. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
60. Mącik, R.; Korba, M. Wiarygodność pomiaru w badaniach mixed-mode: Porównanie efektów stosowania PAPI i CAWI. *Pr. Nauk. Uniw. Ekon. We Wrocławiu* **2010**, *96*, 199–210. (In Polish)
61. Awdziej, M.; Tkaczyk, J.; Włodarek, D. Are elderly consumer more ethnocentric? Attitudes towards Polish and 'foreign' food products. *J. Econ. Manag.* **2016**, *23*, 91–107.

62. Bąk, W.; Łaguna, M.; Bondyra-Łuczka, E. Kwestionariuszowe metody pomiaru ukierunkowań regulacyjnych. Polskie adaptacje kwestionariuszy RFQ i RFS. *Psychol. Społeczna* **2015**, *10*, 84–99. (In Polish) [CrossRef]
63. Balon, U.; Dziadkowiec, J.; Sikora, T. Rzetelność narzędzia FRL (Food Related Lifestyles) w polskim środowisku kulturowym. *Żywność. Nauka. Technol. Jakość* **2015**, *2*, 182–196. (In Polish)
64. Bryła, P. *Marketing Regionalnych i Ekologicznych Produktów Żywnościowych. Perspektywa Sprzedawcy i Konsumenta*; Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego: Łódź, Poland, 2015. (In Polish) [CrossRef]
65. Bryła, P. *Oświadczenia Zdrowotne i Żywieniowe na Rynku Produktów Żywnościowych*; Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego: Łódź, Poland, 2020. (In Polish) [CrossRef]
66. CBOS. Wartości Cenione w Życiu. Research Survey 2012/04. 2012. Available online: https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV6.jsp (accessed on 7 April 2021). (In Polish).
67. European Values Study. 2017 Questionnaire Poland. 2017. Available online: https://europeanvaluesstudy.eu/methodology-data-documentation/survey-2017/full-release-evs2017/participating-countries-and-country-information-survey-2017/ (accessed on 7 April 2021).
68. Nestorowicz, R.; Kaniewska-Sęba, A. Zastosowanie CETSCALE do pomiaru etnocentryzmu konsumenckiego na rynku produktów żywnościowych w Polsce. *Mark. i Rynek* **2014**, *6*, 501–517. (In Polish)
69. O'Sullivan, C.; Scholderer, J.; Cowan, C. Measurement equivalence of the food related lifestyle instrument (FRL) in Ireland and Great Britain. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2005**, *16*, 1–12. [CrossRef]
70. Onwezen, M.; Reinders, M.; Verain, M.; Snoek, H. The development of a single-item Food Choice Questionnaire. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2019**, *71*, 34–45. [CrossRef]
71. Shimp, T.A.; Sharma, S. Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *J. Mark. Res.* **1987**, *XXIV*, 280–289. [CrossRef]
72. Suter, M.B.; Borini, F.M.; Floriani, D.E.; da Silva, D.; Polo, E. Country-of-origin image (COI) as a country-specific advantage (CSA): Scale development and validation of COI as a resource within the firm perspective. *J. Bus. Res.* **2018**, *84*, 46–58. [CrossRef]
73. Lusk, J.L. Effects of Cheap Talk on Consumer Willingness-to-Pay for Golden Rice. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **2003**, *85*, 840–856. [CrossRef]
74. Nicolau, J.L.; Guix, M.; Hernandez-Maskivker, G.; Molenkamp, N. Millennials' willingness to pay for green restaurants. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2020**, *90*, 102601. [CrossRef]
75. Higgins Lab. Measures. Regulatory Focus Questionnaire. Questionnaire and Scoring Instructions. 2018. Available online: http://higginsweb.psych.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/RFQ.pdf (accessed on 9 April 2021).
76. Higgins Lab. Measures. Regulatory Focus Questionnaire. Instructions to Calculate Regulatory Focus Predominance. 2018. Available online: http://higginsweb.psych.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/RFQ_predominance.pdf (accessed on 9 April 2021).
77. Camacho, C.J.; Higgins, E.T.; Luger, L. Moral value transfer from regulatory fit: What feels right is right and what feels wrong is wrong. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **2003**, *84*, 498–510. [CrossRef]
78. Bryła, P. The role of appeals to tradition in origin food marketing. A survey among Polish consumers. *Appetite* **2015**, *91*, 302–310. [CrossRef]
79. Shin, Y.H.; Moon, H.; Jung, S.E.; Severt, K. The effect of environmental values and attitudes on consumer willingness to pay more for organic menus: A value-attitude-behavior approach. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2017**, *33*, 113–121. [CrossRef]
80. Nazzaro, C.; Lerro, M.; Stanco, M.; Marotta, G. Do consumers like food product innovation? An analysis of willingness to pay for innovative food attributes. *Br. Food J.* **2019**, *121*, 1413–1427. [CrossRef]
81. Lappeman, J.; Orpwood, T.; Russell, M.; Zeller, T.; Jansson, J. Personal values and willingness to pay for fair trade coffee in Cape Town, South Africa. *J. Clean Prod.* **2019**, *239*, 118012. [CrossRef]
82. Olbrich, R.; Hundt, M.; Grewe, G. Willingness to Pay in Food Retailing—An Empirical Study of Consumer Behaviour in the Context of the Proliferation of Organic Products. In *European Retail Research. European Retail Research*; Foscht, T., Morschett, D., Rudolph, T., Schnedlitz, P., Schramm-Klein, H., Swoboda, B., Eds.; Springer Gabler: Wiesbaden, Germany, 2015. [CrossRef]
83. Rodríguez-Ortega, T.; Bernués, A.; Alfnes, F. Psychographic profile affects willingness to pay for ecosystem services provided by Mediterranean high nature value farmland. *Ecol. Econ.* **2016**, *128*, 232–245. [CrossRef]
84. Lanzini, P.; Testa, F.; Iraldo, F. Factors affecting drivers' willingness to pay for biofuels: The case of Italy. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2016**, *112*, 2684–2692. [CrossRef]
85. McKay-Nesbitt, J.; Bhatnagar, N.; Smith, M.C. Regulatory fit effects of gender and marketing message content. *J. Bus. Res.* **2013**, *66*, 2245–2251. [CrossRef]